DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 714 HE 014 320

AUTHOR McNulty, Lynda J.; Seagren, Alan J.
TITLE A Report on a Practical Instrument for Analyzing Effectiveness and Group Dynamics of Academic Committees.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Governing Councils; *Committees; *Decision Making; Efficiency; *Group Dynamics; Higher Education; Leadership Qualities; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Australia; University of Nebraska Lincoln

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to analyze the group processes in academic committee meetings, focusing on committee member perceptions of the processes and their effectiveness. Such committees are traditional in higher education, and have long been considered the most efficient and democratic decision-making method. However, they have been criticized as inefficient because they are slow, waste time and money, tend to dissipate responsibility, frequently result in indecision, and often reach decisions that are mediocre compromises. Understanding of group dynamics can help improve faculty committees and their behavior. A questionnaire was pilot-tested at an Australian university, and then sent to all 183 of the 23 officially recognized faculty senate committees of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln; 104 usable responses were received. Responses were scored and a weighting formula was used for computation of item means. Five significant implications surfaced from the study, related to developing committee members' proficiency in (1) evaluating group meeting processes, (2) using a variety of group leadership skills, (3) using controlled group process methods, (4) systematically obtaining feedback on the extent of decision-making efforts, and (5) clarifying task assignments. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208714

A Report on a Practical Instrument for Analyzing Effectiveness and Group Dynamics of Academic Committees

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lynda J. McNulty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Lynda J. McNulty, Ph.D.
Alan T. Seagren, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Paper Presented at the
Annual Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
Los Angeles

April, 1981

HE 014 320

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
CRITICISM OF ACADEMIC COMMITTEES	2
NEED FOR IMPROVING COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS	4
UNDERSTANDING COMMITTEES THROUGH GROUP DYNAMICS	5
SUMMARY	6
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	7
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	7
INSTRUMENTATION	8
DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	8
RATING SCALES	11
CONTENT VALIDATION	11
PILOT AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE CONSISTENCY	12
POPULATION	13
PROCEDURES	13
DATA ANALYSIS	13
Identification of Groups	16
Analysis of the Data for Group I and Group II	17
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	18
Research Questions One and Two	18
Member Participation	19
Task Understanding	20
Atmosphere	21
Leadership Practices	22
Decision Making	22
Research Questions Three and Four	23

Page

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS 31

BIBLIOGRAPHY 35

APPENDICES

A. NUMBER OF MEMBERS SERVING ON THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES DURING THE YEAR OF RESEARCH 37

B. COMPREHENSIVE DATA FOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS ONE AND TWO 38

INTRODUCTION

In large and complex institutions it is seldom feasible for all members of the organization to consider and decide every issue. Therefore, various key individuals are given the responsibility for providing leadership and directing the enterprise. However, these individuals are compelled to rely on group support from colleagues and associates because one or two individuals cannot possess the knowledge and skill needed to determine all the organizational concerns. Therefore, the designation of committees to consider details and make decisions for the large group becomes imperative and inevitable.

Solid entrenchment of faculty committees in American higher education has been traditionally recognized for over half a century.[1] Over the course of decades that these committees have served as major problem solving devices for administrative action, they have been the primary vehicle for handling problems and issues which become too complex for the entire faculty to disentangle. Such problem solving instruments have complemented the participative aspirations of faculty by allowing members to influence the course of the institution and gain insight into its problems.[2]

Moreover, they are often recognized as the most efficient mechanism by which colleges and universities can take full advantage of the expertise

---

[1]James K. Munford, "The Case for Faculty Committees," College and University Journal, 25 (April, 1950), p. 426.

[2]Edgar Friedenburg, "Shifting Conceptions of Learning Institutions in a Polarized Society," Journal of Higher Education, 43 (February, 1972), p. 31.

resident in faculties for the good of the total organization.[3] Thus, the committee system is relied upon to provide vital and necessary functions which enables the organization to operate as a whole. Committees in higher education, then, offer a convenient and useful means of coping with administrative burdens while preserving the traditional prerogatives of faculty involvement in the governance of their institutions.

Committees are felt by many educators to offer the optimum basis for democratic participation and the most practical means of exercising faculty authority. In exercising such prerogatives, faculty, students, and administrators devote an increased proportion of their time, energy, and intelligence to committee work. This trend toward greater participation on campus has resulted in increasing the number of committees within institutions of higher education.[4] Yet mere proliferation of academic committees should not imply their utilization is always successful. Most have made valuable contributions but many have failed and may have done more harm than good because their purpose was poorly defined, they were poorly organized or they failed to attain their established objective.[5]

CRITICISM OF ACADEMIC COMMITTEES

The great temptation among administrators in higher education toward overreliance on committees for decision making has resulted in numerous attacks on the reputation of committees. Principal among the numerous

---

[3]Paul Becker, "Department Executive Committees in Higher Education: A Study of Functions and Effectiveness," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1968), p. 17.

[4]"Conditional Decision Making - Alternative to the Committee Octopus" Journal of Higher Education, 43 (February, 1972), p. 86.

[5]C. Decker and A. Fletcher, "Campus Committees' Values and Hazards," Educational Record, 54 (Summer, 1973), p. 226.

allegations against them are that they are inefficient and slow, are wasteful of valuable time and money, have a tendency to dissipate responsibility, frequently eventuate in indecision, and often reach decisions which represent mediocre compromise.[6] Committees have been openly admonished for their abuse of organizational responsibilities through the use of ineffective, cumbersome administrative procedures. Faculty Committees are often believed to serve primarily as a place of social intercourse.[7]

A major criticism attributed to committees is that they are often deliberately used as a means of delaying decision making rather than promoting it. Committee members are accused of conciously using committee assignments to camouflage highly autocratic or timorous practice to defer action on decision making matters, or simply to avoid goal-directed activity.[8] The system has been accused of obscuring responsibility and making decisions which are of no higher quality than would have been made by able administrators in a fraction of the time.[9] As a result, some faculty suggest that committees serve as a crutch whereby unpopular decisions are sometimes left in their midst. One administrator stated:

> Committees are an organized means of passing the buck. The only reason we have them is that some of our top people can't make up their minds and they want a committee to do it for them.[10]

---

[6]Becker, op. cit., p. 3.

[7]Munford, op. cit., p. 424.

[8]Thomas Henry, "A Descriptive Study of Selected Committees at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1976), p. 16.

[9]"Conditional Decision Making-Alternative to the Committee Octopus," op. cit., p. 86.

[10]L. C. Allen, "Making Better Use of Committees," Readings in Management, edited by Max Richards and William A. Nielander (Cincinnati: Southwestern Publishing Company, 1967), p. 818.

NEED FOR IMPROVING COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS

Despite the controversy, criticism, and satire committees have attracted there appears to be little evidence that they will cease to exist in the educational realm. Committees continue to be a prevalent source and are probably here to stay. One of the most anomalous features about them is that their vehement critics, the faculty who serve on them, are among their most tenacious defenders.[11] Seemingly, committees are observed as providing for the mutual benefit of the academic institution and its members. However, because the committee system has gained a reputation of not being as effective as it could be, it is being forced to justify itself as an aid to administration. If it fails to do so, no useful contribution is made to the goals of the institution through the use of its committees.

At a time when society is demanding more effectiveness from personnel in higher education, improvement in the performance of faculty committees is imperative. Brown attributed the reputation of ineffectiveness of faculty committees to misuse and lack of understanding of them. He stated:

> Despite extensive usage we have not adequately understood or appreciated them. We haven't fully acknowledged what they do best or what they do least well; what can be done to make them more effective instruments.[12]

A thorough investigation of the faculty committee system appears needed to understand what occurs within the group in order that these committees do not become a burden on the faculty, a waste of time for members, and that they do in fact, serve administrators as a source of input on university

---

[11]Becker, Op. Cit., p. 5.

[12]D. S. Brown, "The Management of Advisory Committees Assignment for the 70's," Public Administration Review, 22 (1972), p. 335.

tasks. Unfortunately, there appears to be a lack of systematic study of ways to make committees effective. There has been minimal research on ways to deal with problems confronting committees. Likert has stated the surprising thing about them is that they accomplish as much as they do when so little is known about how they function.[13]

UNDERSTANDING COMMITTEES THROUGH GROUP DYNAMICS

The pervasiveness of committee approaches to decision making in all societal organizations supports the general contention that most activities are carried out on a group basis. Hence, understanding the process of member interaction in any setting appears important for understanding behavior of individuals and organizations.

Decker and Fletcher stated it is time for educators to consider the committee experience from sources outside the academic world in order to adopt relevant practices which contribute to effective organization and cooperation among committee members.[14] Analysis and experiments in group dynamics may provide one of the most fruitful sources of illumination regarding the operation of committees.[15]

Literature from the area of group dynamics affords insight for use in the examination of the "how" and "why" of small group (committee) behavior. The dynamics of these small groups describe the forces that are present in varying degrees in any group situation. How these forces are perceived by individual members has a major influence on the effectiveness of the group.

---

[13]Rensis Likert, "The Nature of Highly Effective Groups," New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), p. 356.

[14]Decker, op. cit., p. 226.

[15]"Faculty of the Training Laboratory in Group Development," School and Society, 66 (December, 1947), p. 475.

Unless a member is aware of the fluctuating forces within the group, his or her actions may be inappropriate to the situation.[16]

Every group meeting has its own dynamics, its own pattern of forces. While these forces exist in varying degrees, they are potentially present in any group situation. According to Bradford, the forces engendered within groups are potent determinants not only of morale but also of productivity. He suggested these forces operate regardless of the nature of the production goal of the group.[17] Moreover, the forces generated within committees can be both destructive or constructive. The possibility of maximizing the constructive value of committee forces lies in the thorough understanding of group dynamics. Knowledged derived from this understanding can enhance the possibility that committee members will be more ably prepared to handle some of the problems and frustrations commonly associated with committee work.

Bradford stated that knowledge gained from understanding group dynamics in a small group such as an academic committee may be useful in modifying member behavior within the group, resulting in improved group functioning.[18] The educator who utilizes such knowledge in committee work should be strengthened in his or her ability to become aware of critical issues as they arise and better prepared to handle them in a constructive manner.

SUMMARY

The use of faculty committees and committee procedures appears to be an established fact of academic life. However, there continues to be

---

[16]David Jenkins, "What is Group Dynamics?" Group Development, edited by Leland Bradford (New York: Learning Resources Corporation/NTL, 1974), p. 7.

[17]Leland P. Bradford, Group Development (New York: Learning Resources Corporation/NTL, 1974), p. 2.

[18]Ibid., p. 2.

considerable discontent on the part of educators with the effectiveness displayed by these committees. In order to increase committee effectiveness, a systematic study of processes which occur within committee operation is warranted. To this end, research on the one aspect of the small group phenomenon may be a viable resource; specifically, group dynamics.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

In order to assess committee effectiveness, this study was designed to provide systematic analysis of the processes which occur within committee meetings. Four research questions were developed to elicit committee members' perceptions of and satisfaction with characteristics of selected group dynamics within committee meetings. In addition, they were designed to determine whether a difference existed on the perceptions of and satisfaction with characteristics of selected group dynamics between members who perceived their committee as effective and members who perceived their committee less effective.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To facilitate attainment of the stated purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What are the perceptions of committee members regarding their observations of characteristics* of selected group dynamics (member participation, task understanding, atmosphere, leadership practices and decision making) within committees?
2. What degree of satisfaction do committee members express concerning their perceptions of characteristics* of selected group dynamics (member participation, task understanding, atmosphere, leadership practices and decision making) observed within committees?

*Derived from Literature

3. Is there a difference in the perception (awareness) of the characteristics* of selected group dynamics (member participation, task understanding, atmosphere, leadership practices and decision making) between committee members who describe their committee as effective and committee members who describe their committee as ineffective?
4. Is there a difference between the satisfaction with the characteristics* of selected group dynamics (member participation, task understanding, atmosphere, leadership practices, decision making) indicated by committee members who describe their committee as effective and the satisfaction with the characteristics of the group dynamics indicated by committee members who describe their committees as ineffective?

INSTRUMENTATION

To provide information on the four research questions, a two-part questionnaire, utilizing effectiveness criteria and descriptive characteristic from literature, was developed. Procedures utilized in the development of the questionnaire are described here in three steps:

1. Development of the Questionnaire.
2. Content Validation.
3. Pilot and Analysis of Response Consistency.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire consisted of two sections: Section I and Section II.

Section I was designed to elicit from the respondents two types of information which the literature suggested would indicate the effectiveness of committees similar to those used in the study. These were:

*Derived from Literature

Part A. The extent to which the established objectives of committees was perceived by their members as being attained over the previous year. For this purpose stated objectives of each selected committee were derived from a committee syllabus and included in the questionnaire. The members of such committees were later asked to respond to each isolated objective. A six-point scale was used to measure how effective each member perceived the committee to be in meeting its stated objectives. The scale ranged from 1, Very Ineffective, (successful less than five percent of the time) to 6, Very Effective, (successful at least 96 percent of the time) in attaining established objectives.

Part B. The extent to which time spent in the meetings of the committees was perceived by members as being effectively utilized. Committee members were asked to respond to four questions derived from the literature relating to time utilization in committee meetings using the same six-point scale as described in Part A. The four questions were:

1. How effective is the committee in considering scheduled agenda items during meetings?
2. How effective is the committee in reaching decisions which, in your opinion, are appropriate for the issues placed before it?
3. How effective is the committee in avoiding unnecessary deviation from scheduled agenda items?
4. How effective is the committee in avoiding unnecessary delay in making decisions?

Section II. From a review of small group literature numerous forces, group dynamics, which influence the effectiveness of group functioning were identified. The value of identifying these dynamics

was considered important for assessing the interactive process of committee deliberation. That is, if members are aware of and sensitive to the various forces, their interactive behavior may then appropriately contribute to promote effective functioning within the group.

A review of the dynamics discussed by seven noted authorities* revealed several dynamics are important influences on the group. However, five dynamics (Member Participation, Task Understanding, Atmosphere, Leadership Practices, Decision Making) were recurrently identified by all seven researchers as most important influences. As a result, these five dynamics were selected for investigation in this study and served as the basis for Section II of the questionnaire.

Section II isolated sixty characteristics of selected committee dynamics which were based upon a priori information and literature sources. Such characteristics were divided between the five major dynamics which were defined as:

Member Participation	14 characteristics
Task Understanding	7 characteristics
Atmosphere	14 characteristics
Leadership Practices	11 characteristics
Decision Making	14 characteristics

Because these dynamics are not necessarily mutually independent, the number of descriptive characteristics varies. For example, fourteen characteristics were found to describe Member Participation while only seven were found to describe Task Understanding. (A list of each selected dynamic and its characteristics are included in Appendix B of this paper.)

---

*Cohen, McGregor, Napier and Gershenfeld, Likert, Sheffield, and Lippitt.

RATING SCALES

Two rating scales were used in Section II to measure the perceptions of respondents for each of the sixty characteristics. These consisted of a three-point rating scale and a four-point rating scale. The three-point scale was designed to indicate the frequency with which members observed each characteristic to occur within the committee meetings. This scale ranged from 1, Rarely Observed to Occur, to 3, Nearly Always Observed to Occur.

The four-point rating scale was designed to indicate the degree of satisfaction respondents felt with the frequency each characteristic was observed to occur during committee meetings. This scale ranged from 1, Very Dissatisfied, to 4, Very Satisfied.

The two rating scales were mutually dependent in measuring a particular characteristic of a committee. For example, a respondent may have observed that two or more members may have dominated committee discussion and may have expressed either satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the observation.

CONTENT VALIDATION

Content validity is the degree to which the items in the questionnaire represent the content that the instrument was designed to measure.[19] For this study such representation was determined through the use of five faculty members recognized for thier expertise in communication and small group research as well as their familiarity with committee procedures. The experts were instructed to rate each item in the questionnaire according to

[19]Donald Ary, Lucy Jacobs and Asghar Razavich, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972), p. 191.

a specific weighting process. The rating ranged from 4, Accept Item As Is, to 1, Reject Item. All items which received a mean score of 3.5 and above from all five experts were included in the final questionnaire. Items receiving less than a mean score of 3.5 were revised to meet the acceptance criteria according to comments supplied by the experts.

PILOT AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE CONSISTENCY

The purpose of the pilot was to determine operational problems with the questionnaire and to obtain data to evaluate analysis and reporting procedures.

The questionnaire was piloted at the Darling Dawns Institute of Advanced Education, Toowoomba, Queensland, Australia, with 86 members of three major governance groups. These groups were selected because their members occupied committee positions similar to the positions of members in committees who comprised the population for this study.

From the pilot survey comments were received regarding particular items for final revision of the instrument. These comments concerned readability of items, time required to complete the questionnaire, ease of item interpretation, and ease of format use of the questionnaire. A follow-up interview with 18 committee members was conducted to obtain specific suggestions for refinement of the questionnaire and information.

Determination of response consistency was accomplished through the use of the Kuder-Richardson split-half formula.[20] Results of the reliability exercise indicated estimates ranged from .575-.865 for Section I and .752-.882 for Section II.

---

[20]L. J. Cronbach, "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests," Psychometrika, 16 (1951), pp. 297-334.

POPULATION

The population identified to receive the questionnaire consisted of all members (183) of the 23 officially recognized Faculty Senate Committees of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The rationale for selecting these University-wide committee members was their representativeness of the total faculty, their active functioning as a natural group rather than an artifact of laboratory research, and their importance to the governance of the University. The number of members serving on each Faculty Senate Committee ranged from three to fourteen (See Appendix A.)

PROCEDURES

The questionnaires were sent (through campus mail) to committee members with instructions to return the completed instrument through the same means. A face-to-face contact was made as a follow-up to remind participants to return the forms. From this procedure, one hundred thirty questionnaires were returned. However, only one hundred four contained responses which were usable in a quantitative analysis. Twenty-six questionnaires were returned partially completed or blank accompanied by explanations for not completing the questionnaire. These included: New Membership, Unqualified to Respond, Committee Had Not Met Since Membership Began, Committee Voted the Questionnaire Did Not Apply to its Situation, and Too Small a Return from a Committee.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data for research questions one and two, concerned with committee members' 1) perceptions of and 2) satisfaction with characteristics of five selected group dynamics within committee meetings, were analyzed according to the following procedure. The one hundred four responses to

each of the sixty items categorized under five group dynamics were aggregated for each item. A mean and standard deviation were calculated for each item. A group mean score was reported for each of the five dynamics. The frequency of responses on the three-point scale (perceptions) and the four-point scale (satisfaction) was included as well. The three-point response pattern was chosen for ease of response by committee members. Moreover, the wording of the characteristics was such that observations could result in either positive or negative perceptions. That is, those characteristics perceived to occur some of the time or nearly always (as indicated by a mean response of 2.0 or above) could indicate positive perceptions of committee behavior if the characteristics were stated in a positive manner. Those characteristics perceived to occur rarely (as indicated by a mean response of less than 2.0) could also indicate positive perceptions of committee behavior if the characteristics were stated in a negative manner.

In computing the mean response for each item the number of responses in each frequency interval was multiplied by the score (3,2, or 1) representing the interval. These products were summed and the results divided by the total number of committee members responding for that particular item.

The formula used to compute the mean response was:

$$\text{Mean Response} = \frac{\text{Number responses for an interval} \times \text{Score assigned to the interval}}{\text{Total number of reponses}}$$

For example: One characteristic of member participation, "Opportunity for participation is provided to all members," had the following responses: Nearly Always = 92; Some of the Time = 12; Rarely = 0. Using the Mean Response formula, the following computation occurs.

$$\text{Mean Response} = \frac{(92 \times 3) + (12 \times 2) + (0 \times 1)}{104} = 2.88$$

Because of the positive and negative wording of the characteristics, a conversion method was used on particular items to facilitate comparison of mean responses for all items. That is, where a respondent selected a response of 1 on a negatively worded characteristic that response was converted to a 3 for the analysis of data. An example of using the Mean Response formula on a negatively worded item is:

Example: "Three or more members tend to dominate the discussions," had the following responses: Nearly Always = 10; Some of the Time = 54; Rarely = 40.

$$\text{Mean Response} = \frac{(10 \times 1) + (54 \times 2) + (40 \times 3)}{104} = 2.28$$

In this way, the means on all items were computed in a comparable manner.

In order to describe characteristics of a group dynamic which were perceived to occur most or least often within committee meetings, the first and fourth quartile of the total number of characteristics for each group dynamic was determined. Because each dynamic was described by varying numbers of characteristics, the number of items discussed in the narrative differ. That is, for Member Participation fourteen characteristics were listed. For Task Understanding a total of seven were identified. Therefore, the narrative on Member Participation presents the upper and lower four items for discussion whereas the narrative on Task Understanding contains a discussion on the upper and lower two items. This criterion was selected because it is a common means of identifying the more extreme responses of the response range.

Research question three and four were designed to determine whether a difference existed on 3) the perceptions of and 4) satisfaction with

characteristics of selected dynamics between members who perceived their committee as effective and members who perceived their committee less effective. Analysis of data for these questions required identification of two groups and comparison of the members' responses. Procedures which were utilized were:

I. IDENTIFICATION OF GROUPS

a. A hierarachical group technique,[21] referred to as cluster analysis, was used based upon Section I of the questionnaire. In this section, two areas were used to identify the perceptions of committee members regarding the effectiveness of their respective committees. These areas were achievement of objectives and time utilization. Scores obtained on the questions asked within these two areas were aggregated for each member and a mean score was obtained.

b. Cluster analysis compared the score profile and progressively placed individual members into groups of participants in such a way as to cluster scores which indicated similar attitudes that the committee was effective. Conversely, scores of individuals who indicated similar attitudes that a committee was less effective were progressively clustered. Progressive clustering of individuals' scores in this way minimized the overall estimate of variance within the groups and maximized the distance between groups. Using this technique, two groups of participants were identified:

[21]Donald Veldman, Miscellaneous Statistical Methods (Chicago, Illinois: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), pp. 309-412.

Group I consisted of forty-one members of the Faculty Senate Committees who ranked their committee as most effective in attaining established objectives and in utilizing meeting time.

Group II consisted of fifteen members of the Faculty Senate Committees who perceived their committee as least effective in attaining established objectives and utilizing meeting time.

C. For the purpose of the analysis the responses of the members identified in Group I (most effective) and Group II (least effective) were compared. Responses of the forty-eight remaining members (middle ranking group) were not used in the analysis.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA FOR GROUP I AND GROUP II

The aggregate scores of the members of Group I and Group II were calculated for each dynamic. A mean and a standard deviation was obtained for the two groups under each dynamic. An a priori test of significance (using an F test) was conducted on the grand mean of each group. This test was used to determine whether, overall, the two groups were significantly different in terms of their perceptions and perceived satisfaction with the nature of the dynamics. Where a significant difference was found a post hoc test was conducted using discriminant analysis to identify which of the group dynamics contributed most to the differentiation between the groups.[22]

[22]William W. Cooley and Paul Lohnes, "Discriminate Analysis," Multivariate Data Analysis (New York: John Wiley, 1971).

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Research Questions One and Two

Data for research questions one and two, perceptions of and satisfaction with characteristics of five selected group dynamics within committee meetings, included a group mean response for each of the five dynamics. These responses for each research question are presented in the following Table.

TABLE 1

Group Mean Responses For Perception and Satisfaction With Each of the Five Group Dynamics

Group Dynamic	Group Mean on Perception	Group Mean on Satisfaction
Member Participation	2.53	3.35
Task Understanding	2.70	3.43
Atmosphere	2.58	3.37
Leadership Practices	2.41	3.42
Decision Making	2.44	3.37

Analysis of the data indicates Task Understanding received the highest mean response for both variables, perception and satisfaction. This finding reflects the fact that the task dimension was perceived to be the most obvious concern of the committees over the remaining four dynamics which included items related to the maintenance function of the groups. Leadership Practices received the lowest group mean response for perception, yet received the second highest ranking for satisfaction. While generally high satisfaction was indicated with all five dynamics, Member Participation received the lowest group mean response. This may reflect the fact that more

process items related to the socio-emotional dimension of committees described Member Participation rather than items describing the task dimension.

More specific explanations may be gained by analyzing results on the perception and satisfaction of the most critical characteristics describing each major group dynamic. A comprehensive detail of frequency responses, mean scores, and standard deviations for each concerning perception and satisfaction of characteristics is included in Appendix B. A summary of those detailed results is provided below, supported, in part, by specific member comments.

Member Participation

Findings concerning the awareness of characteristics of the dynamic Member Participation indicated at least three-fourths of the members observed nearly always that discussions remained pertinent to the task. All members perceived they had the opportunity to participate in discussion providing they were notified in advance of the meeting time and place. Members were rarely observed to speak in technical vocabularies for the purpose of impressing others. Where the use of technical vocabularies was observed, members commented that the newness or unfamiliarity of terms may have been a factor. Members were rarely observed to discuss issues previously covered or to prematurely discuss agenda items.

Characteristics of the dynamic Member Participation which were observed less frequently were concerned with the interactive behavior patterns of members. That is, despite the opportunity for all members to participate, the amount of participation was not observed to be shared equally by all

members. Three or more members were observed some of the time or nearly always to dominate the discussions. The characteristic receiving the lowest response was concerned with analysis by the group of member participation habits. Comments by some members indicated this activity was considered time-consuming, unnecessary, and a waste of time.

Committee members indicated they were very satisfied with the opportunity to participate in discussions and that discussion remained pertinent to the committee's task. They were also very satisfied that members appeared to want to contribute to achieving the assigned task and that members with knowledge and/or expertise were sought out as resource persons. Members indicated some dissatisfaction with those members observed to dominate the discussion since speaking time for others was diminished. In addition, some dissatisfaction with the use of unfamiliar vocabulary exhibited by some members was indicated. Yet, members did indicate they were satisfied that repetitious and time-consuming contributions were rarely observed. The majority of members indicated they were satisfied that periods for analysis of member participation habits were not observed.

Task Understanding

Committee members indicated satisfaction with the fact that the assigned task was nearly always observed to be accepted by the group and that deliberations on issues focused on those tasks. While, overall, members were rarely observed to attempt to achieve personal objectives different from the established objectives considerable differences of opinion with satisfaction with this observance was indicated. Moreover, even though tasks were observed to be accepted by most members, some members indicated they rarely observed the task to be clearly understood by all members. As a result,

members indicated some dissatisfaction with their security in making decisions concerning task assignments. Specific comments from members indicated the committee often deferred its decision making on the task to a higher body.

Atmosphere

The prevailing atmosphere of the committee meetings was reportedly reflective of cooperative relationships among members. Committee members indicated they were satisfied with the frank expression of opinions on assigned tasks and the exhibition of confidence and trust among members. The majority of members expressed satisfaction with the fact that new ideas were judged in a noncritical manner. Satisfaction was also indicated with the fact that progress in meetings was observed since minimal competitive forces were noted. Respondents indicated criticism of ideas was observed nearly always to be constructive rather than a personal affront to other members yet, some dissatisfaction was indicated with the disruption, upon occasion, of surface agendas by individual personal agendas.

Characteristics of atmosphere which received lower mean responses from respondents were generally more often related to the personal feelings and opinions of members than to task features of the meetings. That is, frank expression of opinions about the meeting process was rarely observed since attention by the group to process variables was unnecessary and wasteful of valuable time. Members indicated they were rarely aware of other members' feelings about issues under discussion and that new ideas of members were judged critically by others. The characteristic receiving the lowest mean response was related to the focus of criticism on obstacles preventing task accomplishment by the group.

Leadership Practices

Committee members indicated generally positive perceptions of their designated leaders in performing role functions. The majority of members indicated they were very satisfied that leaders were observed nearly always to permit free expression of opinions, to adhere to procedural rules, and to be well informed on the assigned tasks. Over half the members indicated they were very satisfied with their leader's skill in managing the meetings when necessary.

Despite the high degree of member satisfaction with leader role functions, they were less than satisfied with the observance that the style of leadership exhibited by chairpersons remained unchanged from meeting to meeting despite situational changes within the group. In addition, some dissatisfaction was indicated by members whose designated leaders suggested final conclusions which were eventually reached by the group. Yet, comments from a few members indicated that this phenomena was the result of similar views rather than manipulation by the chair.

Decision Making

Characteristics concerned with the product(s), decision(s), of committee deliberations were more often observed than characteristics related to the process of making decisions. That is, committee members indicated they nearly always observed final decisions to be based on an analysis of available data. Members indicated they were very satisfied with the group's committment to decisions and that the group assumed full responsibility for those decisions. However, some

dissatisfaction was indicated because decisions were often prematurely reached before a thorough discussion was held.

Members' perception of the process of decision making indicate parliamentary procedure was used more often by the committees than any other decision making technique. As a result, members indicated that only a simple majority was used to make group decisions. Some dissatisfaction was indicated with the fact that members rarely observed, prior to the beginning of discussion, agreement to the techniques to be used during the meetings. Individual comments by members indicated that either parliamentary procedure or consensus was the technique desired to be utilized most often. The greatest amount of dissatisfaction indicated by members was related to their perception that decision making efforts appeared to have little influence on the institution.

Research Questions Three and Four

Data for research questions three and four, concerned with determining the difference between two groups' perceptions of and satisfaction with characteristics of selected group dynamics within committee meetings, are presented in Tables 2 - 7 and discussed below.

The first set of data, presented in Table 2, includes identification of each of the five variables labeled group dynamics in Column 1. For each dynamic, a mean score and a standard deviation were computed for Group I (effective group) and Group II (less effective group). The final column contains the difference of the mean scores for the two groups.

TABLE 2

Awareness of Group Dynamics: A Comparison Between the "Effective" and "Less Effective" Groups

Variable	Group I (Effective) N = 41 Mean	SD	Group II (Less Effective) N = 15 Mean	SD	Difference between Group Means
Task Understanding	2.61	.219	2.16	.269	.45
Leadership Practices	2.48	.308	2.25	.432	.23
Decision Making	2.37	.285	1.97	.210	.40
Member Participation	2.07	.284	1.94	.217	.13
Atmosphere	1.81	.358	1.70	.265	.11

The data in Table 2 indicates that the effective group was more aware of selected group dynamics than the less effective group. The differences between the means are more pronounced in the areas of Task Understanding (.45) and Decision Making (.40). The differences in both areas exceed one standard deviation. Less pronounced differences occurred for Leadership Practices (.23), Member Participation (.13), and Atmosphere (.11).

Responses from the effective group showed greater variance in the areas of Atmosphere (.358) and Leadership Practices (.308) while there was greater variance for Leadership Practices (.432) in the less effective group.

A summary of the analysis for the second set of data collected for research question three is contained in Table 3 which presents for each dynamic the among and within mean standard score as well as the F ratio for each variable. The F ratio for the overall discrimination was the relevant statistic utilized to answer the following hypothesis generated for research question three.

H_1 That the F value for the overall discrimination between the two groups in relation to their awareness of group dynamics was significant.

TABLE 3

Awareness of Group Dynamics: A Priori Test of Significance between Means of the Two Groups (Univariate F with 1 and 54 Degrees of Freedom .05 Level of Significance)

Variable	Among Mean Score	Within Mean Score	F Ratio
Task Understanding	2.20	.05	40.62
Decision Making	1.68	.07	23.45
Leadership Practices	.58	.12	4.86
Member Participation	.18	.07	2.52
Atmosphere	.14	.11	1.27
F ratio for overall discrimination = 9.42			
(F ratio significant at the .05 level = 4.02)			

From an analysis of Table 3 it can be seen that the F ratio for overall discrimination was 9.42 which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, there was a significant difference between the two groups and H_1 is not rejected, namely:

> There was a significant difference between the two groups in relation to their perception of group dynamics with their committee meetings.

General analysis of Table 3 indicates that Decision Making and Task Understanding, with F ratios of 40.62 and 23.45 respectively, were the two variables which most likely contributed to the overall significant difference. However, a post hoc discriminant analysis test was run to verify this finding from the general analysis of Table 3. Table 4 presents the results of the discriminant analysis. Figures in column two represent the factor structure evolved from use of discriminant analysis. Factor

structures above .40 were considered to meet the criterion of contributing to the difference between the two groups.[23]

TABLE 4

Awareness of Group Dynamics: Post Hoc Discrimination Analysis Factor Structure for Discriminant Analysis

Variable	Factor
Task Understanding	.924
Decision Making	.776
Leadership Practices	.405
Member Participation	.297
Atmosphere	.214

Support for the a priori test of significance is indicated by data presented in the above table; that is, two discriminating factors, Task Understanding (Factor .924) and Decision Making (Factor .776) are identified as the variables which contributed most to differences between the two groups. (This process is similar to determining factors in factor analysis.)

Observations from Table 5, concerned with satisfaction of characteristics between two groups, indicate that for each of the group dynamics the mean responses indicated that the effective group was more satisfied with observations of selected group dynamics than the less effective group. The differences between the means are more pronounced with the variables Task

[23]Price, James L. Handbook of Organizational Measurement (Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath & Co., 1972.)

Understanding (.67), Member Participation (.64), and Decision Making (.63). The difference in these three cases exceed one standard deviation. Less pronounced differences occurred for Leadership Practices (.56) and Atmosphere (.51).

TABLE 5

Satisfaction with Characteristics of Selected Group Dynamics: A Comparison between the "Effective" and the "Less Effective" Groups

Variable	Group I (Effective) N = 41 Mean	SD	Group II (Less Effective) N = 15 Mean	SD	Difference between Group Means
Task Understanding	3.73	.349	3.06	.496	.67
Leadership Practices	3.64	.514	3.08	.613	.56
Decision Making	3.63	.489	3.00	.571	.63
Member Participation	3.63	.383	2.99	.461	.64
Atmosphere	3.60	.482	3.09	.548	.51

Responses from the effective group showed greatest variance of opinions with the variable Leadership Practices (.514). More variance with satisfaction with Leadership Practices (.613) was found among responses from the less effective group. Further comparison of the data between the effective group and the less effective group indicate that, for the effective group, on every variable the mean scores were higher and the standard deviations were lower than those of the less effective group. In addition, a greater variance of opinion on each variable was observed among the less effective group overall than the effective group.

Table 6 contains an analysis for the second set of data collected on research question four. For each dynamic the among and within mean scores are entered in columns two and three. The F ratio determined for each variable is entered in the final column. The F ratio for the overall discrimination was the relevant statistic utilized to answer the following hypothesis generated for the research question.

H_1 That the F value for the overall discrimination between the two groups in relation to their satisfaction with observations of group dynamics was significant.

From an analysis of Table 6 it can be seen that the F ratio for overall discrimination was 9.43 which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, there was a significant difference between the two groups and H_1 is not rejected, namely:

There was a significant difference between the two groups in relation to their satisfaction with observations of group dynamics.

General analysis of the data indicates that Task Understanding and Member Participation with F ratios of 32.17 and 27.33 respectively were those variables most likely contributing to the overall significant difference. However, a post hoc discriminant analysis test was run to verify this finding from the general analysis of data in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Satisfaction with Characteristics of Selected Group Dynamics:
A Priori Test of Significance Between Means of the Two Groups
(Univariate F with 1 and 54 Degrees of Freedom
.05 Level of Confidence)

Variable	Among Mean Score	Within Mean Score	F Ratio
Task Understanding	4.95	.15	32.17
Member Participation	4.49	.16	27.33
Decision Making	2.36	.26	16.63
Leadership Practices	3.43	.29	11.70
Atmosphere	4.83	.25	11.34
F ratio for overall discrimination = 9.43			

(F ratio significant at the .05 level = 4.02)

The results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 7. The first column identifies each of the five group dynamics included in Section II of the questionnaire. Figures in column two represent the factor structure evolved from use of discriminant analysis.

TABLE 7

Satisfaction with Characteristics of Selected Group Dynamics:
Post Hoc Discrimination Analysis Factor Structure
for Discriminant Analysis

Variable	Factor
Task Understanding	.861
Member Participation	.817
Decision Making	.684
Leadership Practices	.595
Atmosphere	.587

Support for the a priori test of significance is indicated by data presented in Table 7. Although all five dynamics met the general criterion of .40 and above, two discriminating factors, Task Understanding (Factor .861) and Member Participation (Factor .817) were identified as the variables contributing most to difference between the two groups. (This process is similar to determining factors in factor analysis.)

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

There were five significant implications which surfaced from the study. These implications were related to developing proficiency in Committee members to:

i. Evaluate Group Meeting Process

ii. Utilize a Variety of Group Leadership Skills

iii. Utilize Controlled Group Process Methods

iv. Systematically Obtain Feedback on the Extent of Decision Making Efforts

v. Clarify Task Assignment(s)

Each of the stated implications receives support from data specifically analyzed in the previous section and summarized below.

Evaluate Group Meeting Process

Findings from the study indicated committee members were most aware of and satisfied with characteristics related to the task dimension of committee meetings while conciously ignoring the process dimension. Attention to member participation habits was considered unnecessary and wasteful of valuable time. However, some dissatisfaction was indicated with members who dominated the discussions or who attempted to impress others by using unfamiliar or technical vocabulary. While the prevailing atmosphere of most committee meetings reflected cooperative relationships among members, any sharing of ideas on committee process was conciously neglected. Such disregard for the socio-emotional dimension of committee meetings may suggest that members are not aware of how to systematically analyze member behavior and may have the impression that to do so takes up more valuable time than is useful.

Utilize a Variety of Group Leadership Skills

Findings concerning Leadership Practices generally indicated satisfaction with the performance of expected role functions by the designated leaders. However, members indicated some dissatisfaction that their leaders' personal style of leadership remained unchanged despite situational changes from meeting to meeting. In addition, members observed leaders to be insensitive to the personal needs and motivations of individual members upon occasion. This may suggest members and leaders require training opportunities which allow a variety of leadership skills to be developed and practiced for use in actual group meetings.

Utilize Controlled Group Process Methods

Members indicated considerable satisfaction that realistic and obtainable decisions emanating from discussion were based on an analysis of available data and that members appeared to assume responsibility for those decisions. However, some dissatisfaction was indicated with the fact that decision making procedures were not always agreed upon by the entire group prior to the beginning of discussion. Members indicated decisions were commonly made by a simple majority since reliance on formal discussion procedures was most evident; however, consensus was desired as a decision making technique by some members. Such findings may indicate the need for committee members to be exposed to and skilled in the use of a variety of group process methods, including controlled process methods such as Nominal Group Technique, Structured Group Interview, Brainstorming, or Brainwriting.

Systematically Obtaining Feedback on Extent of Decision Making

Committee members generally perceived committee decisions to have little influence on the parent institution despite member commitment to

decisions reached. This dichotomy may suggest members are earnest in their decision making efforts but receive little or no feedback on the actual extent of their efforts. More systematic use of the element of feedback in the communication process may be needed in order to provide evidence to members on the actual extent of their decisions' influence on the University.

Clarify Task Assignment(s)

Results indicated members who perceived their committee as effective were more aware of and satisfied with the characteristics of all five group dynamics than members who perceived their committee as less effective. A significant difference was found between the two groups in relation to their awareness of and satisfaction with group dynamics within committee meetings. Two discriminating factors were identified to contribute most to the difference on awareness and satisfaction between the two groups. These were Task Understanding and Decision Making for awareness and Task Understanding and Member Participation for satisfaction. Thus, the most important factor contributing to differences between the two groups in this study was made by awareness of and satisfaction with characteristics of Task Understanding. Moreover, members indicated that, while tasks were generally accepted by committee members, clear understanding of the task requirements by all members was not observed as often. This may suggest inadequate orientation to the task by designated leaders and members prior to beginning discussion of an issue. Implications for training committee participants in the skills of small group task acclimation and clarification may be made.

A major focus of this paper was to report on one investigative tool developed to collect evaluative data on academic committees. The instrument is believed to serve as an adequate and useful initial diagnostic tool. Future studies on committees should incorporate the instrument into a comprehensive battery of techniques; e.g. critical incidents, interviews, observations, in order to isolate specific areas of concern within committee deliberations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, L. C. "Making Better Use of Committees," Readings in Management. edited by Max Richards and William A. Nielander. Cincinnati: Southwestern Publishing Company, 1967, p. 818.

Ary, Donald, Lucy Jacobs and Asghar Razavich. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972, p. 191.

Becker, Paul. "Department Executive Committees in Higher Education: A Study of Functions and Effectiveness," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1968, p. 17.

Bradford, Leland P. Group Development. New York: Learning Resources Corporation/NTL, 1974, p. 2.

Brown, D. S. "The Management of Advisory Committees Assignment for the 70's," Public Administration Review 22 (1972), p. 335.

"Conditional Decision Making - Alternative to the Committee Octopus." Journal of Higher Education 43 (February, 1972), p. 86.

Cooley, William W. and Paul Lohnes. "Discriminate Analysis," Multivariate Data Analysis. New York: John Wiley, 1971.

Cronback, L. J. "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests." Psychometrika 16 (1951), pp. 297-334.

Decker, C. and A. Fletcher. "Campus Committees' Values and Hazards." Educational Record 54 (Summer, 1973), p. 226.

"Faculty of the Training Laboratory in Group Development." School and Society 66 (December, 1947), p. 475.

Friedenburg, Edgar. "Shifting Conceptions of Learning Institutions in a Polarized Society." Journal of Higher Education 43 (February, 1972), p. 31.

Henry, Thomas. "A Descriptive Study of Selected Committees at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1976, p. 16.

Jenkins, David. "What is Group Dynamics?" Group Development. edited by Leland Bradford. New York: Learning Resources Corporation/NTL, 1974. p. 7.

Likert, Rensis. "The Nature of Highly Effective Groups," New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961. p. 356.

Munford, James K. "The Case for Faculty Committees," College and University Journal 25 (April, 1950), p. 426.

Price, James L. Handbook of Organizational Measurement. Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath & Co., 1972.

Veldman, Donald. Miscellaneous Statistical Methods. Chicago, Illinois: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967. pp. 309-412.

APPENDIX A

NUMBER OF MEMBERS SERVING ON THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES DURING THE YEAR OF RESEARCH

Committee	Number of Members
Academic Freedom and Tenure	6
Appeals for Student Suspension and Dismissals	6
Budget	3
Calendar and Examinations	8
Commencement	9
Committee on Committees	9
Computational Services and Facilities	13
Conciliation	3
Convocations	7
Curriculum	14
Employee Benefits	11
Executive	11
Grading	10
Grievance	6
Honorary Degrees	7
Honors Convocation	10
Human Rights	6
Intercollegiate Athletics	7
Professional Conduct	7
Rules and By-Laws	3
Scholarly Publications	8
Scholarships and Financial Aid	11
University Libraries	8
Total	183

APPENDIX B

COMPREHENSIVE DATA FOR RESEARCH

QUESTIONS I AND II

MEMBER PARTICIPATION	QUESTION I - AWARENESS					QUESTION II - SATISFACTION					
	FREQUENCY RESPONSE				STANDARD DEVIATION	FREQUENCY RESPONSE					STANDARD DEVIATION
	3	2	1	MEAN		4	3	2	1	MEAN	
1. Opportunity for participation is provided to all members.	92	12		2.88	.321	81	21	2		3.76	.569
2. Discussions in meetings remain pertinent to the task.	78	26		2.75	.435	58	43	3	1	3.53	.607
3. Three or more members tend to dominate the discussions.	10	54	40	2.29*	.681	31	65	7	1	3.21	.669
4. Two or more members attempt to impress others through use of technical vocabularies.	3	11	90	2.84*	.449	55	34	11	4	3.35	.875
5. Participation during the meetings is shared equally among all members	49	46	9	2.38	.679	37	59	8		3.28	.675
6. Because a few members talk too much, the amount of time for others to speak is decreased.	6	29	69	2.61*	.592	35	51	15	3	3.13	.835
7. More often than not, participation is carried on for the benefit of individuals rather than for the benefit of the group.	4	20	80	2.73*	.535	47	41	13	3	3.27	.844
8. Members appear skilled in membership roles required for interaction, e.g., listening, clarifying, questioning, etc.	63	39	2	2.58	.646	51	50	3		3.46	.649
9. Contributions from members who possess experience and/or knowledge related to an issue are sought out by other members.	70	31	3	2.64	.598	56	45	3		3.50	.652

*Converted Mean

MEMBER PARTICIPATION (continued)	QUESTION I - AWARENESS FREQUENCY RESPONSE 3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	QUESTION II - SATISFACTION FREQUENCY RESPONSE 4	3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
10. Members appear to want to contribute to the task of reaching the established objectives.	77	27		2.74	.515	71	33			3.68	.589
11. Factual information is available when the committee needs it.	51	51	2	2.47	.661	39	55	8	3	3.26	.703
12. Two or more members are consistently unsystematic in their contributions, e.g., they prematurely discuss or unnecessarily reconsider issues.	3	15	86	2.80*	.496	44	43	14	3	3.23	.848
13. Portions of each meeting are set aside for analysis of member participation habits.	3	5	96	1.11	.447	36	50	15	3	3.14	.817
14. Repetitions and time-consuming explanations are characteristic of specific members.	7	27	70	2.61*	.588	35	48	20	1	3.13	.832

*Converted Mean

	QUESTION I - AWARENESS					QUESTION II - SATISFACTION					
	FREQUENCY RESPONSE					FREQUENCY RESPONSE					
TASK UNDERSTANDING	3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	4	3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATIO
1. Tasks in meetings appear to be clearly understood by all members.	61	40	3	2.56	.553	49	46	8	1	3.37	.685
2. Two or more members attempt to achieve personal objectives which are different from the established objectives.	4	12	88	2.81*	.424	44	46	10	4	3.25	.788
3. Members appear to accept tasks assigned to the group.	78	26		2.75	.435	65	35	4		3.59	.566
4. Member deliberations focus on achieving assigned tasks.	77	26	1	2.73	.447	61	41	2		3.56	.535
5. Members appear to feel secure in making decisions concerning assigned tasks.	54	46	4	2.48	.574	41	55	8		3.31	.627
6. Members possess the potential ability to contribute to the achievement of the assigned tasks.	71	33		2.68	.467	56	42	6		3.49	.607
7. Task assignments are appropriate.	72	31	1	2.69	.463	52	48	4		3.47	.613
ATMOSPHERE											
1. Committee members appear to have confidence and trust in one another	81	23		2.77	.417	64	37	3		3.58	.550
2. There is frank expression of ideas and opinions on assigned tasks.	86	17	1	2.81	.426	68	33	3		3.62	.543

*Converted Mean

ATMOSPHERE (continued)	QUESTION I - AWARENESS FREQUENCY RESPONSE 3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	QUESTION II - SATISFACTION FREQUENCY RESPONSE 4	3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
3. As a result of unnecessary competition among members, progress in meetings is impaired.	4	9	91	2.84*	.464	56	37	8	3	3.40	.757
4. New ideas are explored in a non-critical manner.	44	52	8	2.34	.619	48	52	4		3.42	.569
5. There is frank expression of opinions concerning the meeting process.	43	36	25	2.18	.797	42	55	6	1	3.33	.632
6. Each member appears to be aware of how others feel about matters under discussion.	43	56	5	2.35	.573	39	60	5		3.34	.570
7. The printed agenda is too often disrupted by individual members' personal agendas.	4	9	91	2.84*	.464	48	44	9	3	3.32	.756
8. During meetings two or more members appear to be repeatedly bored.	5	23	76	2.68*	.598	41	47	11	5	3.19	.808
9. Deliberations during meetings produce tension among members.	5	18	81	2.73*	.565	45	48	10	1	3.32	.714
10. Members appear indifferent to each other during meetings.	6	14	84	2.75*	.516	49	39	10	6	3.39	.724
11. Two or more members are unable to cope with occasional criticism of their ideas from other members.	5	7	92	2.84*	.484	44	54	3	3	3.37	.679
12. Criticism by members focuses on removing obstacles which prevent the group from accomplishing its tasks.	20	32	52	1.69	.776	38	57	6	3	3.26	.671

*Converted Mean

ATMOSPHERE (continued)	QUESTION I - AWARENESS FREQUENCY RESPONSE 3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	QUESTION II - SATISFACTION FREQUENCY RESPONSE 4	3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
13. Members appear to feel that personal feelings are inappropriate to the discussion.	13	27	64	2.49*	.710	48	44	9	3	3.32	.756
14. When ideas are attacked by someone in the meeting other members become inhibited.	3	19	82	2.76*	.492	46	42	13	3	3.26	.794
DECISION MAKING											
1. A simple majority is used to make group decisions.											
2. There is commitment among members to decisions reached.	72	28	3	2.64	.526	64	33	7		3.55	.620
3. Decisions are often reached before issues are thoroughly discussed by members.	5	25	74	2.66*	.587	41	48	10	5	3.20	.828
4. Parliamentary procedure is employed in the conduct of most meetings.	38	47	19	2.80	.746	55	44	5		3.48	.590
5. Decision-making procedures used by the group vary from meeting to meeting.	6	39	59	2.51*	.653	43	49	6	6	3.24	.815
6. The group assumes full responsibility for decisions reached during the meeting.	74	28	2	2.69	.496	62	34	8		3.52	.639
7. Decisions reached by the members are usually based upon an analysis of available data.	78	24	2	2.73	.487	64	32	8		3.54	.633

*Converted Mean

DECISION MAKING (continued)	QUESTION I - AWARENESS FREQUENCY RESPONSE 3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	QUESTION II - SATISFACTION FREQUENCY RESPONSE 4	3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
8. Final decisions appear to have little influence on the institution.	13	41	50	2.36*	.707	32	39	21	12	2.88	.974
9. Decisions made by the group are realistic and attainable.	70	32	3	2.66	.535	61	35	8		3.51	.646
10. During the meetings members evaluate the possible consequences of decisions reached.	63	41		2.61	.527	51	49	4		3.45	.573
11. Members appear to deliberate decisions as much after the meeting as during a meeting.	4	28	72	2.65*	.626	41	50	11	2	3.25	.554
12. Members consider a range of alternative solutions in the decision-making process.	48	53	3	2.44	.571	50	51	3		3.45	.554
13. Before discussion begins members are agreed upon decision-making procedures which will be used.	40	42	22	2.16	.764	47	48	7	2	3.06	.753
14. Decisions reached during the meeting appear to represent the will of all members involved in making the decisions.	62	40	2	2.58	.589	57	43	4		3.51	.667
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES											
1. The designated leader permits free expression of opinions by members.											
2. The leadership style of the designated leader changes from situation to situation.	90	14		2.86	.343	79	20	5		3.71	.551

*Converted Mean

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES (continued)	QUESTION I - AWARENESS FREQUENCY RESPONSE 3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	QUESTION II - SATISFACTION FREQUENCY RESPONSE 4	3	2	1	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
3. Final conclusions reached by the group are generally the same as those suggested by the designated leader.	12	51	41	2.28*	.660	35	52	12	5	3.13	.821
4. The designated leader adheres to procedural rules.	67	36	1	2.62	.506	47	42	5		3.50	.591
5. During the meeting members with particular expertise on an issue undertake a leadership role.	49	44	11	2.35	.667	53	42	9		3.42	.649
6. The designated leader appears to be sensitive to the personal needs and motivations of individual members.	51	49	4	2.44	.471	45	52	7		3.37	.610
7. The designated leader is well informed on each assigned task.	65	38	1	2.61	.508	54	42	8		3.44	.636
8. The designated leader exhitits skill in managing the meeting when necessary.	63	39	2	2.58	.532	56	39	9		3.45	.651
9. At the end of the meeting the designated leader summarizes what has been discussed and decided upon by members.	42	52	10	2.31	.696	50	50	4		3.40	.587
10. The designated leader acts as a facilitator rather than the principal decision maker.	63	37	4	2.57	.569	60	32	11		3.44	.682
11. Procedures used in meetings are suggested by the designated leader.	48	48	8	2.38	.628	55	42	7		3.46	.622

*Converted Mean